

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36316/36317

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 727
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: December 16, 2009
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DOUGLAS G. WOOD,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Second Judicial District, State of Idaho, Idaho County. Hon. John H. Bradbury, District Judge.

Judgments of conviction and consecutive unified sentences of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for battery with the intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer and a determinate term of twenty-five years for assault with the intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer, affirmed.

Greg S. Silvey, Kuna, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

In these consolidated cases, Douglas G. Wood pled guilty to battery with intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer, Idaho Code §§ 18-911, 18-915(a) and he also pled guilty to assault with intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer, Idaho Code §§ 18-901, 18-915. The district court sentenced Wood to consecutive unified sentences of fifteen years, with a minimum period of confinement of five years, for battery with the intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer and a determinate term of twenty-five years for assault with the intent to commit a serious felony on a peace officer. Wood appeals asserting that the district court abused its discretion by imposing excessive sentences.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Wood's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.